# REMARKS

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4 and 6-13 are currently pending

- Claim 1 is amended herein

**[0002]** Support for the amendments to the claim is found in the specification at least at [0029].

## Claim Objections

**[0003]** Claim 1 stands objected to as allegedly comprising an informality. More specifically, it is stated in the OA at page 3 "claim 1 recites 'wherein upon a specific component of the second subset of components is requested' (lines 26-27). It is believed this should read 'wherein <u>when</u> a specific component of the second subset of components is requested". Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner rendering the objection moot.

## Cited Documents

**[0004]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Kraenzel: Kraenzel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,742,026 B1

- Li: Li et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/010445

- Gamo: Gamo, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0107291

## § 103 Rejections

**[0005]** Claims 1, 4 and 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kraenzel, Li, and Gamo in various combinations. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

*Independent Claim 1*

**[0006]** The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 5-6) the following (in pertinent part) with regard to claim 1:

> **Li** teaches a manifest *(par. [0046] "the list of modules downloaded in operation 146 of Fig. 3")* that further identifies offline applications *(i.e. applications to be stored on a client)* as a first subset of components of the application as required *(par. [0046] "application 160 core modules")*, a second subset of components of the application as on-demand *(par. [0046] "non-core modules"; note these modules are "downloaded and installed when needed" and thus constitute 'on-demand' applications see par. [0048])*, wherein the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background as a user interacts with the application *(par. [0053] "the modules enabling feature functionality may also be downloaded in the background prior to being requested")*,

**[0007]**   The cited references, and specifically Li, does not describe each and every recital of claim 1 which is copied below (in pertinent part):

> a manifest that specifies a first subset of components of the application as required, a second subset of components of the application as on-demand, and a third subset of components of the application as online, with the first, second, and third subsets of components of the application differing, wherein **the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background** as a user interacts with the application, wherein when a specific component of the second subset of components is requested, **the specific component takes precedence over remaining components** of the second subset of components and is **downloaded on-demand while the remaining components are drizzle-downloaded in the background**.

**[0008]**   Li describes at ¶[0060]:

[0060] Alternatively, if the module requested is not the module being downloaded by the download manager in decision operation 234 of FIG. 10, then the method proceeds to operation 240 where the current download is suspended. For example, a user wishes to rotate an image and needs module 4 ($M_4$) for the feature functionality. However, the module being downloaded by the download manager is module 3 ($M_3$). The download of $M_3$ is suspended in operation 240 so that $M_4$ may be downloaded without competing with $M_3$ for bandwidth. In one embodi-

ment of the invention, the download manager logic comprising this decision operation is only initiated when the user interrupts the methodical download of the modules as governed by the priority list. The method advances to operation 242 where the requested module is downloaded. Continuing with the example above, $M_4$ would be downloaded here as $M_3$ is suspended. In one embodiment, another instantiation of the code which was downloading $M_3$ is used to download $M_4$. In operation 244, the requested module is installed. The method moves to operation 246 where the thread for the suspended download is resumed. In reference to the above example, the downloading of $M_3$ is resumed upon the installation of $M_4$. Then in operation 248, the method proceeds to operation 220 of FIG. 8 where the module is downloaded.

[0009]    Thus, Li describes "if the module requested is not the module being downloaded....the current download is suspended.  See [0060].  More specifically, the downloaded of a module $M_3$ is <u>suspended</u> such that a module $M_4$ may be downloaded without competing with $M_3$ for bandwidth.  See [0060].  However, Applicant's claim 1 recites the specific component takes precedence over remaining components …and is downloaded on-demand <u>while the remaining components are drizzle-downloaded in the background</u>.  Li does not describe the module $M_4$ being downloaded on demand while module $M_3$ is downloaded in the background.  Further, Li teaches away from module $M_4$

being downloaded on demand while module $M_3$ is downloaded in the background by advocating suspending downloading of module $M_3$.

[0010] As shown above, Li, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Further, Kraenzel and Gamo do not overcome the deficiencies of Li. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

*Remaining Pending Claims*

[0011] In addition to their own merits, dependent claims 4 and 6-13 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 6-13.

## Conclusion

[0012] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Michael D. Carter 56661/                    Dated:  /Nov. 6, 2009/
Michael D. Carter (michaelcarter@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5004)
Registration No.  56661

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162x5005)
Registration No. 53725